RHETORICAL DISPLAYS OF KNOWLEDGE IN *LEUCIPPE AND CLITOPHON*: ANIMAL TALK

Progymnasmata in particular, and rhetoric in general, are typically acknowledged to have influenced the composition of Greek novels[1]. As regards Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Clitophon*[2], recent studies have discussed how Clitophon, the main character and also the principal narrator, has a tendency to indulge in exuberant rhetorical displays, even when he has no real knowledge to sustain these[3]. The purpose of this paper is to evaluate the rhetorical skills of the characters of *L&C* through an analysis of their basic rhetorical output. The fables, narratives and descriptions produced by the characters in the novel should help us to understand their characterisation better, as well as the uses and social significance of rhetoric in *L&C* (i.e. how rhetoric is used according to age, gender and social criteria). In order to maintain this research within manageable boundaries, the principal focus will be on displays of knowledge in relation to one topic, namely animals[4].

1. Fables.

The first composition practised at school, according to the treatises by Hermogenes, Aphthonius, Nicolaus and Quintilian (1.9.2), was the fable[5], of which we have two instances in *L&C*. Clitophon tells how one of Leucippe's mother's slaves obstructs his attempts to get into the girl's room at night, by keeping the women's area under constant surveillance (2.20.1 ff.). Clitophon portrays this slave as πολυπράγμων καὶ λάλος καὶ λίχνος (2.20.1), a good description of a mosquito (κώνωψ)[6], which is suitable because his name,

[1] Anderson 1984, 43-74; Ruiz Montero 1994, 1041-4; Hock 1997, 449-65; Fernández Garrido 2009.

[2] Henceforth AT and *L&C*, for the sake of simplicity.

[3] Whitmarsh 2003; Morales 2004; Marinčič 2007; Morgan 2007.

[4] Animals were a literary topic, treated among others by Pliny, the Oppians and Aelian. Thus, when passengers in the ship ξύλοις ἀπερρωγόσι συμπεσόντες ἐπείροντο δίκην ἰχθύων (3.4.6), Clitophon is referring to *Od*. 10.124. The omen narrated in 5.3.3-4 is suspiciously similar to that described in A.R. 3.540-54.

[5] It is chronologically impossible that Achilles Tatius could have read Men.Rh., Aphth. and Nic., but their texts record rhetorical strategies which had long been in use. As regards Theon, the text by Patillon-Bolognesi 1997 is quoted, and the Greek text for Hermog.'s and Aphth.'s *Prog*. is Patillon 2008 (Rabe's numeration will also be quoted). Felten 1913 has been followed for Nic.'s *Prog*., Russell-Wilson 1981 for Men. Rh., and Garnaud 1991 for *L&C*.

[6] Compare with the description of Muia, the girl who was turned into a fly: Luc. *Musc. Enc*. 10 πάνυ καλήν, λάλον μέντοι γε καὶ στωμύλον καὶ ᾠδικήν. Mosquitoes are persistent (always whining, never silent), and a nuisance by day and at night (Ael. *NA* 14.22). Conops

Conops (Κώνωψ), is associated with these insects. In an attempt to befriend him, Clitophon's slave, Satyrus, teases him because of his name (2.20.2), but Conops narrates a fable to make it clear that he will not be easily dismissed (2.20.3-21.4). He tells of a lion which cannot stand the shame of being afraid of cockerels and only gives up his plans for suicide after meeting an elephant which is very frightened of mosquitoes: the comparison of himself with the elephant, and of the cockerel with the mosquito, brings him instant relief.

Conops is not a good fabulist. Although he cites standard notions about the behaviour of the animals[7], his fable cannot be deemed credible because mosquitoes are always defeated in fables, owing to their natural vulnerability[8]. Praising them reminds us of Lucian's impossible task of praising a fly (Luc. *Mus. Enc.*). The moral is also awkwardly applied to the mosquito ('mosquitoes are so powerful that even elephants are afraid of them')[9], and Conops misses an apt comment, such as 'valour is a relative asset' or 'comparison with others puts things in perspective'[10].

Satyrus then counterattacks with a second fable involving the same characters, an appropriate answer to Conops' claim regarding the power of mosquitoes (21.5-22.7). A mosquito challenges a lion with a refutation of its virtues and a self-eulogy[11], and drives the larger animal mad with several quick bites to sensitive areas of its body. The lion admits defeat at this point, and the mosquito, proudly celebrating its triumph, falls by accident into a spider's web. Satyrus thus comments on Conops' insignificance and pretension in challenging somebody who is bigger than him – Clitophon is a free man, while he is only a slave – and predicts that a small, previously un–

stays awake at night and is persistent in his spying. On mosquitoes in Greek literature, s. Delhay 1990, 125-8; Morales 2004, 84-7.

[7] Cf. Ael. *NA* 3.31, 5.50.1, 6.22, 8.28, on the lion's fear of cockerels. The elephant fanning its ears (*NA* 21.3) is a common sight, as are insects buzzing around the ears and noses of animals (*NA* 21.4, Lucian *Musc.* 6.3-5). According to Aelian (*NA* 1.38.1; 8.28, 36), elephants fear pigs and rams, not insects, but he also writes about the power small insects have over bigger animals and plants (6.35-8).

[8] Delhay 1990, 119. On the need to attribute appropriate traits to the characters of the fable, see Hermog. *Prog.* 1.4 (2.3-10 Rabe); Nic. 7.14-8.11. On plausibility in fables, see Gangloff 2002, 27-8.

[9] Theon 75.20-76.6 refers to two ways to introduce a fable into a longer narrative: either the fable is told and then the narrative brought in, or else the narrative comes first and the fable second. In both cases, fable and narrative should contain a common element which motivates the inclusion of the former.

[10] On the moral, see Theon 75.20-76.6; Nic. 9.16-11.2. This fable could be refuted as inconvenient (ἀσύμφορα): see Theon 76.8-11.

[11] It shares some motifs with Luc. *Musc. Enc.*: on beauty, compare Luc. 1.11-2.1 with AT 2.22.2; on the insects' ability to fly long distances, see Luc. 2.5-6 and, again, AT 2.22.2.

noticed menace will bring about his downfall.

The rhetorical confrontation between the two slaves shows Satyrus as a clear winner: the animal protagonists (the buzzing mosquito, the powerful yet clumsy lion and the opportunistic spider) are portrayed according to their nature, the moral is appropriate, and the narrative is drawn out through the addition of speeches, as rhetors suggest for such cases[12]. Satyrus' fable is endorsed, too, by subsequent events: though Conops is at work hindering Clitophon's plans, he accepts Satyrus' innocent-sounding invitation for dinner and is neutralised with a sleeping potion in his last cup[13]. Satyrus' triumph, however, is only partial, because he fails to apply the moral of the fable to his own situation. In his vainglory, he compares his feat with Odysseus' drugging of the Cyclops with wine (2.23.3), boasting as carelessly as the insect in the fable, which suggests that he may have overlooked another menacing presence (the spider). This takes the form of Leucippe's mother (2.23.4-6), who, awoken by a nightmare, rushes into her daughter's room immediately after Clitophon, frustrating his sexual expectations and nearly catching hold of him. Rhetorical skills here are shown as superficial knowledge which does not necessarily imply success.

Conops and Satyrus, two slaves, are the only characters in *L&C* to use fables at length to convey their thoughts, while more cultured characters draw on mythical narratives when in need of a powerful parallel[14]. Despite numerous instances of literary fables[15] and of their use as *paradeigmata* in speeches[16], delight in the extensive telling of fables was considered only suitable for children and uneducated people[17]. In other words, fables formed part of the sociolect or shibboleth of the lower classes, and those wishing to appear educated in their speech boast of knowledge in animals in other

[12] Theon 75.17-18 Ἐπεκτείνομεν δὲ τὰς ἐν τῷ μύθῳ προσωποποιΐας μηκύνοντες; Hermog. *Prog*. 1.5-7 (2.11-3.14 Rabe).

[13] See Laplace 2007, 160-3 for further analogies of the animals with the characters in the novel.

[14] See Men. Rh. 389.9-18, 392.28-33. On the use of the *exemplum* or παράδειγμα as an ornamental and logical means of persuasion, see Demoen 1997, 129-35.

[15] See the quotations in Theon 66.8-15, 74.15-23 and Hermog. *Prog*. 1.2 (1.6-8 Rabe).

[16] E.g. Menelaus uses Aesop 103 H.-H. in his tirade against women (*L&C* 2.38.2). For the theory, see Aristotle *Rh*. 1393b-1394a; Hermog. 1.10 (4.2-3 Rabe); Aphth. 1.1 (1.4-5 Rabe); Men.Rh. 490.20 ff.

[17] On the appreciation of fables, see Quintilian 5.11.9 *Illae quoque fabellae… ducere animos solent praecipue rusticorum et imperitorum, qui et simplicius, quae ficta sunt, audiunt, et capti uoluptate facile iis quibus delectantur consentiunt*. In Philostr. *VA* 5.14, Menippus says that only children and old women 'swallowed' fables, but Apollonius appreciates the wisdom they contained.

forms. It should be remembered that this is the only case in *L&C* where a slave is characterised by his speech. In every other case they draw on the same rhetorical resources as their masters[18], to adapt to their masters' speech and/or to suit the taste of an educated audience.

2. Animal narratives.

Theon's definition of narrative (78.16-17 Διήγημά ἐστι λόγος ἐκθετικὸς πραγμάτων γεγονότων ἢ ὡς γεγονότων)[19] clarifies that these compositions deal both with fictional and non-fictional materials as if they were real. A good narrator will use the elements of his narrative (person, event, time, place, manner, and cause)[20] to provide the listener with an account and clarification of the action (Nic. 4.17-18 ἔργον δὲ καὶ αὐτῆς καὶ τέλος τὸ παράδοσιν καὶ δήλωσιν ποιῆσαι τῷ ἀκροατῇ τοῦ πραγμάτος). Narratives describing animals, in particular, usually exploit the ancient notion that animals and humans inhabited parallel worlds.

This notion sustained comparisons between human and animal nature: while humans facilitated the understanding of animal species[21], animals could be used as a model of moral behaviour[22], as a means of comparison or entertainment in speeches[23], or to characterise human behaviour in fables. Events in the animal world predict future events in the human one: a snake eating a nest of ten birds, for example, foretells that Troy will fall after the tenth year of war (*Il*. 2.311-18), and Penelope dreams that her twenty geese are killed by an eagle (*Od*. 19.535-53), a prediction of the massacre of her twenty suitors, with Odysseus depicted as a powerful predator and the suitors as weak prey. This comparative function of animal narratives (with descriptive and proleptic aspects) enables them to act as a mirror or mise-en-abyme of their closer context or even of the whole work.

Animal stories also have a capacity for conveying general truths which

[18] E.g. Sosthenes praises his master Thersander when inducing Leucippe to marry him (6.12-13), resorting to mythological comparisons (see the analysis of Men. Rh. in Gangloff 2002, 50-1): 6.13.2 Εἶτα κατέλεγε τὴν ναυαγίαν, ἐκθειάζων ὡς ἐσώθη, καὶ τερατευόμενος ὑπὲρ τὸν δελφῖνα τὸν Ἀρίωνος.

[19] See also Hermog. *Prog*. 2.1 (4.6-7 Rabe), Aphth. 2.1 (2.14-15 Rabe), Nic. 4.16, 11.14-15.

[20] Theon 78.17-79.19, Aphth. 2.3 (2.23-3.2), Nic. 13.14-14.3 (adding ὕλη, matter).

[21] Bartley 2003, 210-63; Rebuffat 2001, 187-246.

[22] Kindstrand 1998, 2964-8.

[23] Men. Rh. parallels animal and human behaviour (396.18-21, 397.6-9, 436.26-33), and finds stories on animals and plants highly entertaining (392.28-393.9). Compare with the use of animals in speeches, such as those by Themistius, regarding which see Borgognoni 2007.

the characters in *L&C* tend to ignore. Wanting to inspire love in Leucippe[24], Clitophon follows Clinias' advice of avoiding explicit sexual talk with a maiden for the sake of modesty (1.10.2 ff.). He stages for Leucippe a speech on love in animals and rivers, similar to the one constructed by Menander Rhetor as an illustration of the power of love (401.26-9). Clitophon starts with a peacock trailing his fan nearby to seduce a peahen, and, to make his message clear, he adds other four stories of love between animals, plants, minerals and rivers[25]. In all cases he attributes human characteristics to the natural elements and emphasises the different forms and roles of the male and the female, with the male playing the active role[26]. Leucippe is expected to infer that all beings succumb to love, and that it is males who play the leading role in the courtship.

This first animal narrative on the peacock shares with similar ones (Luc. *De domo* 11; Ael. *NA* 5.21; D. Chrys. *Or*. 12.2-3) the motifs of praise of the beauty of the animal, comparison of the colours of its plumage with a meadow full of flowers, and self-consciousness of the animal, proudly showing off its beauty (1.16.2-3). The female, in contrast, does not receive much attention, and should be quickly seduced by the impressive appearance of the male. Clitophon's attitude comes close to the peacock's: both the animal and the boy show their erotic interest with a scenic enactment of their best attributes (the peacock's beautiful tail and Clitophon's witty speech). Dio Chrysostom (*Or*. 12.1-4) famously depicted the pompous sophists as peacocks, and this image was so common that Hermogenes states, in relation with the plausibility needed by the characters in fables: οἷον περὶ κάλλους τις ἀγωνίζεται; ταὼς οὗτος ὑποκείσθω (*Prog*. 1.4 [2.7-8 Rabe]). Clitophon

[24] *L&C* 1.16.1 Βουλόμενος οὖν ἐγὼ εὐάγωγον τὴν κόρην εἰς ἔρωτα παρασκευάσαι, λόγων πρὸς τὸν Σάτυρον ἠρχόμην. Compare with Clitophon's earlier comment: 1.5.5-6 Τοῦτό [a slave has just interpreted the legend of Apollo and Daphne] μου μᾶλλον ἀσθὲν τὴν ψυχὴν ἐξέκαυσεν· ὑπέκκαυμα γὰρ ἐπιθυμίας λόγος ἐρωτικός. Κἂν εἰς σωφροσύνην τις ἑαυτὸν νουθετῇ, τῷ παραδείγματι πρὸς τὴν μίμησιν ἐρεθίζεται.

[25] Both Men. Rh. 401.29-402.2 and *L&C* 1.18.1-2 mention Alpheus and Arethusa. On the use of *exempla* in series, see Demoen 1997, 146-7.

[26] Magnet (f.) and iron (m.) (1.17.2) are two different minerals where the female attracts the male – it is he who moves, and they kiss like humans. As regards palm trees (1.17.3-5, on which see Bartsch 1989, 156-7), the male lusts after the female, and the gardener takes a shoot of the female to the male: it is a botanic marriage. Alpheus and Arethusa (1.18.1-2) are different sources of water (a river and a spring), and he takes to her the offerings given to him by worshippers: a transmarine marriage. The viper (m.) and the lamprey (f.) (1.18.3-5) belong to different species; theirs is a case of anthropomorphised courtship (see Morales 1995, 42; Laplace 2007, 187-9). On anthropomorphism in animal stories, see Rebuffat 2001, 187-246; Bartley 2003, 210-63.

parades his rhetoric like both a peacock and a sophist[27], with excessive self-assurance and vanity.

The second animal *paradeigma* deals with the love of the viper and the lamprey, a paradoxographic story which goes beyond a plain narrative into the realms of mythical exaggeration[28]. A comparison of Clitophon's narrative with similar ones (Ael. *NA* 1.50, 9.66; Opp. *Hal*. 1.554-79) reveals that Clitophon has introduced the idea of courtship as a two-stage process, in which the male takes the initiative and waits for the female to answer[29]:

1.18.4-5 Ὅταν οὖν εἰς τὸν γάμον ἐθέλωσιν ἀλλήλοις συνελθεῖν, ὁ μὲν εἰς τὸν αἰγιαλὸν ἐλθὼν συρίζει πρὸς τὴν θάλατταν τῇ σμυραίνῃ σύμβολον, ἡ δὲ γνωρίζει τὸ σύνθημα καὶ ἐκ τῶν κυμάτων ἀναδύεται. Ἀλλ᾽ οὐκ εὐθέως πρὸς τὸν νυμφίον ἐξέρχεται - οἶδε γὰρ ὅτι θάνατον ἐν τοῖς ὀδοῦσι φέρει -, ἀλλ᾽ ἄνεισιν εἰς τὴν πέτραν καὶ περιμένει τὸν νυμφίον καθᾶραι τὸ στόμα. Ἑστᾶσιν οὖν ἀμφότεροι πρὸς ἀλλήλους βλέποντες, ὁ μὲν ἠπειρώτης ἐραστής, ἡ δὲ ἐρωμένη νησιῶτις. Ὅταν οὖν ὁ ἐραστὴς ἐξεμέσῃ τῆς νύμφης τὸν φόβον, ἡ δὲ ἐρριμμένον ἴδῃ τὸν θάνατον χαμαί, τότε καταβαίνει τῆς πέτρας καὶ εἰς τὴν ἤπειρον ἐξέρχεται καὶ τὸν ἐραστὴν περιπτύσσεται καὶ οὐκέτι φοβεῖται τὰ φιλήματα.

Clitophon is staging Clinias' approach to maidens here: in the first place, let her see you and believe that she is desired, so that she imitates your desire (1.9.5-6); then, approach and kiss her, observing whether she softens to your advances, and if she does, assume the directorial role (1.10.5-7). The viper's whistling, compared by Aelian (*NA* 1.50) to a reveller's knocking at the door, and Clitophon's speech invite the females to approach them and signal the use of the amatory code[30].

[27] He takes in earnest Clinias' comment: 1.10.1 αὐτοδίδακτος γάρ ἐστιν ὁ θεὸς [Eros] σοφιστής. See also 5.27.4 Αὐτουργὸς γὰρ ὁ Ἔρως καὶ αὐτοσχέδιος σοφιστὴς καὶ πάντα τόπον αὑτῷ τιθέμενος μυστήριον.

[28] On paradoxography and narrative, see Gangloff 2002, 39-41. On paradoxography as a usual element in animal stories, see Rebuffat 2001, 135-44. On the rhetorical uses of paradoxography, see Hermog. *Prog*. 7.5 (15.19-21 Rabe), 7.9 (16.18-21 Rabe); Men. Rh. 371.2-14, 419.29-30.

[29] On the reshaping of myths, see Men. Rh. 341.19 ff. and commentary in Gangloff 2002, 53-4.

[30] Clitophon uses the usual signals of lovers: 2.3.3 Clitophon and Leucippe exchange meaningful looks; 2.6.2 Ἡ δὲ μειδιάσασα γλυκὺ καὶ ἐμφανίσασα διὰ τοῦ γέλωτος, ὅτι συνῆκε πῶς εἶπον τὸ Χαῖρε, δέσποινα᾽, then Clitophon evokes Heracles, a model for bridegrooms (Men.Rh. 405.24-8); 2.7 Clitophon feigns having been bitten by a bee in order to be kissed by Leucippe, and ὡς δὲ συνῆκεν ὃ λέγω καὶ ἐμειδίασε (2.7.6); 2.9 Clitophon kisses the place on the cup where she has drunk, and she understands this and imitates him. On the *actio* of male lovers, see Toohey 1997, 200-2.

As regards the second stage, both Aelian (9.66) and Oppian (*H*. 1.559-62, 571-3) agree that the viper vomits the venom alone as a preparation for the mating (not before the female, as part of the courtship), and gulps it down again afterwards. Clitophon's story is slightly different: the lamprey knows that the viper is venomous and, despite their mutual attraction, she will not go any closer to him until he becomes harmless to her. The animal narrative reflects the part of the human courtship in which the male lover marries the female beloved, therefore ceasing to be a menace for her virginity (any close contact with men before marriage would raise doubts over her virginity and thus ruin her chances of a good match)[31].

The narratives of the peacock and the snakes are timely and well composed, but the comparison of the male lover with the peacock and the viper has the disadvantage of relating the female to a peahen (of a dull brown colour and dazzled by the colours and exhibitionist behaviour of the peacock) and a lamprey (a particularly ugly-looking eel, which bites into the flesh of other fish to suck their blood)[32]. This seems tactless, since Clinias has just told Clitophon of the importance of testifying to the girl's beauty (1.9.6). In fact, Clitophon's references to Leucippe's beauty are consigned to his thoughts and not verbalised before the girl:

1.19.1-2 Τὸ δὲ κάλλος ἀστράπτον τοῦ ταὼ ἧττον ἐδόκει μοι τοῦ Λευκίππης εἶναι προσώπου. Τὸ γὰρ τοῦ σώματος κάλλος αὐτῆς πρὸς τὰ τοῦ λειμῶνος ἤριζεν ἄνθη. Ναρκίσσου μὲν τὸ πρόσωπον ἔστιλβε χροιάν, ῥόδον δὲ ἀνέτελλεν ἐκ τῆς παρειᾶς, ἴον δὲ ἡ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν ἐμάρμαιρεν αὐγή, αἱ δὲ κόμαι βοστρυχούμεναι μᾶλλον εἰλίττοντο κιττοῦ· τοσοῦτος ἦν Λευκίππης ἐπὶ τῶν προσώπων ὁ λειμών.

By returning to the beginning of the scene, with Leucippe surrounded by flowers (1.15.4-6 ivy, narcissi, roses, violets), and the comparison of the peacock with a meadow, Clitophon seems to admit the defeat of his *paradeigmata*, none of which included any obvious comparison of Leucippe with a flower.

When Clitophon has finished his show, Leucippe stages her own in refutation of his. Of the two songs of her music practice (2.1.1-3)[33], the first one, the Homeric fight between the boar and the lion (*Il*. 16.823-6), proposes a

[31] As her mother reminds Leucippe when she finds Clitophon in her daughter's room at night: 2.24.1-4.

[32] Neither do the other three narratives reflect on the beautiful appearance of the female: the magnet (female) desires the iron; the male palm tree lusts after the female (no flowers); the river Alpheus is in love with the spring Arethusa (no mentions of her beauty).

[33] Laplace 2007, 191-6 interprets them as an opposition between homosexual and heterosexual love.

more violent model for courtship: two males (Hector and Patroclus) fight like wild animals (a lion and a boar) for the sake of a woman (Helen). Love and courtship are not simply a sweet affair of two partners, as defended by Clitophon's *paradeigmata*[34], and the violent attacks of Leucippe's suitors will confirm her point. Her second hymn (2.1.2-3), on the beauty of the rose, continues the metaphor of the girl as a flower[35], naturally charming and powerless, contrasting with the previous models, all of which have lacked a reference to feminine beauty. The contrast is notable between Clitophon, engaged in shameless self-promotion based on his rhetorical knowledge (made up, incidentally, of very general topics), and Leucippe, who simply points out what she is, without any fuss. Their performances reveal two different styles: Clitophon wants to show off his knowledge, while Leucippe sticks to her topic.

Despite Clitophon's claim that his speech was a clever improvisation making the most of a fortuitous combination of factors (he was with Satyrus in the garden when Leucippe happened to turn up and the peacock unexpectedly opened its tail), the elements used in his speech are too trite to consider him more than an ordinary orator. The situation itself is far from uncommon: would-be lovers were advised to parade their knowledge before their sweethearts (Ovid *Ars Amat*. 1.218-28), and two other characters in the novel behave like Clitophon. See in the first place Thersander, trying to engage Leucippe in conversation: καρτερήσας δ' οὖν καὶ παρακαθίσας διελέγετο, ἄλλοτε ἄλλα ῥήματα συνάπτων οὐκ ἔχοντα νοῦν. Τοιοῦτοι γὰρ οἱ ἐρῶντες, ὅταν πρὸς τὰς ἐρωμένας ζητήσωσι λαλεῖν (6.18.2-3).

Charmides' behaviour is even closer to Clitophon's. The narrator recounts how some soldiers captured a hippopotamus, adding a brief description of the animal (4.2.2-3)[36], a threatening image because it focuses on the animal's gaping mouth[37]. Charmides invites Clitophon, Leucippe and Satyrus to see the animal and, struck by Leucippe's beauty, he parades his knowledge about it. He mostly limits himself to well-used notions about the

[34] Compare with Theon 78.1-4 (on the arguments for refutation): ἐκ δὲ τοῦ ψευδοῦς, ὅταν μὴ κατὰ πᾶν συμβαίνῃ, ὥς φησιν ὁ μυθογράφος, ὅτι οἱ τῶν πλείονων ὀρεγόμενοι καὶ τῶν ὄντων στερίσκονται· οὐ γὰρ ἀεὶ τοῦτο ἀληθές ἐστιν.

[35] The floral metaphor occurs on Leucippe's first appearance (1.4.3). Compare with Aphth. 2.5 (22 Rabe): Διήγημα τὸ κατὰ ῥόδον· δραματικόν.

[36] Analysed in Laplace 2007, 147-51.

[37] 4.2.3 Κεφαλὴ περιφερής, οὐ σμικρά· ἐγγὺς ἵππου παρειαί. Μυκτὴρ ἐπὶ μέγα κεχηνὼς καὶ πνέων πυρώδη καπνὸν ὡς ἀπὸ πηγῆς πυρός. Γένυς εὐρεῖα, ὅση καὶ παρειά· μέχρι τῶν κροτάφων ἀνοίγει τὸ στόμα· ἔχει δὲ καὶ κυνόδοντας καμπύλους, κατὰ μὲν τὴν ἰδέαν καὶ τὴν θέσιν ὡς ἵππος, τὸ δὲ μέγεθος εἰς τριπλάσιον.

animal[38], including the voracity (4.3.2) which makes it so dangerous, but adds the description of an unusual hunting method (4.3.3-4), whereby the locals observe its routines, dig a trench in a place where the animal often grazes, and insert a cage covered with reeds to trap it[39].

For Charmides, as for Clitophon, one animal paradigm is not enough, and he moves on to tell them about the elephant (4.3.5-5.3). His physical description (4.4.4-6) deals with familiar commonplaces, the well-known features of the elephant, namely the tusks and the trunk[40]; just as the hippopotamus was compared with a more common animal, the horse, the elephant is compared to an ox[41]. Its behaviour (4.4.5 on how it uses its trunk) and pregnancy[42] are also described, as are the bond of the animal with its owner (4.5-6; cf. Ael. *NA* 4.24, 10.10, 12.44). The whole passage is in accordance with what we are told in Aelian, except the story of elephants curing headaches with their breath (4.7-5.3), unheard of in any previous Greek text, though some elements appear elsewhere and made it plausible to the eyes of ancient readers[43].

Charmides' narrative fails to affect his object, Leucippe, but it does seduce Clitophon, who keeps asking questions (4.4.1). In addition to this, the general does not absorb the wisdom offered by his own narrative and is defeated and killed (4.13-14). If a moral can be drawn from the hunting of the hippopotamus, it is that greed makes animals (and people) forget about their security, and thus leads to their downfall. The bandits set a trap for Charmides, hiding their strongest young men behind a wall of suppliants with branches, just as the cage was covered with reeds. When Charmides refuses to accept their terms of surrender, trying greedily to acquire all the honours of their defeat, they launch a furious attack and annihilate his army.

The narratives of Clitophon and Charmides are correct, but commonplace. The main reason for their failure is that, though they possess a reasonable command of the general notions of speaking, they do not take in the

[38] See esp. Diod. Sic. 1.35.8-11, but also Hdt. 2.71; Arist. *HA* 502a.9-15; Plin. *NH* 8.95.

[39] The usual method seems to have been the one mentioned in Diod. Sic. 1.35.10: a group of men attack the hippopotamus with harpoons, until it dies from loss of blood.

[40] Compare with Arist. *HA* 497b.26-8; Ael. *NA* 4.31.

[41] 4.4.4 οἷα τῶν βοῶν ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλή; 4.5.3 ἔστι δὲ τοῖς ἐλέφασι σιτίον, ὡς τοῖς βουσὶ παρ᾽ ἡμῖν ἡ πόα.

[42] On this controversy, see Arist. *HA* 546b.10, *GA* 777b.15; Plin. *NH* 8.28; Ael. *NA* 4.31.

[43] Ael. *NA* 1.38.1 and 13.8: elephants enjoy the aroma of perfumes and flowers; 9.56 on their sense of smell; 2.18 on their eating olive flowers or oil to heal war wounds; and 7.45 on their ability to retrieve weapons from wounds. In Philostr. *VA* 2.11, an elephant can be so tame as to allow its owner to put his head in its mouth. Laplace 2007, 97-106 links the descriptions of the elephant and the phoenix.

teachings of the most basic narratives. They are like children who do not fully understand the moral of a fable, though they enjoy the main narrative on the animal. Their rhetorical efforts, in both cases addressed to Leucippe, are defeated because they do not take her into account. With Clitophon, she strikes back, and with Charmides we are not even told about her response. Both men fail to realise that the first aim of rhetorical displays is to persuade the listener, and they seem only to be interested in putting up a rhetorical show. These animal narratives reflect the gap between the superficial use of rhetorical strategies and the assimilation of real knowledge, evident in the speeches by Clitophon and other male characters.

His sophistic displays characterise Clitophon as an ordinary speaker who cannot cross the threshold of superficial knowledge, and avoids reflecting on the consequences of his narratives. Charmides' and Thersander's similar rhetorical behaviour suggests that this is a male characteristic. On the other hand, Leucippe's refutation of Clitophon's *paradeigmata* reveals a clever mind, getting her message through, though she has to restrain herself in her speech because of her sex and age.

After the basic narrative, the next step on a scale of difficulty would be to produce a longer one, perhaps with a mythical topic. Rhetorical treatises deal with mythical narratives in different circumstances: they are to be refuted for their lack of credibility or immorality[44], or reshaped and adapted for the aesthetic pleasure they produce[45], and in order to transfer their cultural prestige through comparison to the subjects of the encomium[46]. These functions come together in the debate on heterosexuality and pederasty (2.35-8), where Menelaus defends pederasty by saying that no female lover of Zeus (Alcmene, Danae, Semele) was instantly brought up to Olympus as Ganymede was (2.36.2-4). Clitophon replies to Menelaus' point by saying that Zeus even came down to earth for the sake of women and transformed himself into a bull (for Europa), a Satyr (for Antiope) and a golden shower (Danae), while the rape of Ganymede, on the other hand, was rather distasteful:

2.37.3-4 Ἐλεῶ δὲ αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν ἁρπαγήν· ὄρνις ἐπ᾽ αὐτὸν κατέβη ὠμηστής, ὁ δὲ ἀνάρπαστος γενόμενος ὑβρίζεται καὶ ἔοικεν τυραννουμένῳ. Καὶ τὸ θέαμά ἐστιν αἴσχιστον, μειράκιον ἐξ ὀνύχων κρεμάμενον. Σεμέλην δὲ εἰς οὐρανοὺς ἀνήγαγεν οὐκ ὄρνις ὠμηστής, ἀλλὰ πῦρ.

[44] See Gangloff 2002, 29-31, 33-34.

[45] See Gangloff 2002, 39-42, 46-9. The use of myths is appropriate for the ἄνετος style ("relaxed"), and appropriate for the storyteller, whose aim is to produce pleasure (see Pernot 1993, 340-4).

[46] Pernot 1993, 768-72; Gangloff 2002, 50-1.

Clitophon refutes the myth with a very down-to-earth account: he does not speak of Zeus flying Ganymede to Olympus, but of a bird of prey which lives on a diet of raw meat, raping an ephebe and dangling it from its talons[47]. His strategy is effective, but, like his subsequent description of a female orgasm (2.37.5-10), too crude to be appropriate in a cultured discussion. Clitophon knows the rhetorical techniques, but ignores the aesthetics: to profit from the aesthetic pleasure and cultural prestige of a mythical reference, it was suggested that the unpleasant (here bestial) details[48] or those that place the gods in inappropriate situations be avoided or at least disguised[49].

Narratives involving local myths were the key element in the praising of cities under the head of origin[50], and played an important role in the construction of local identities, just as attachment to the Olympic gods confirmed the Greekness of a country or person. If Clitophon is a Tyrian, then he should know the local myths[51], and he proves this to be the case when he recounts the celebration of the local festival of 'Dionysus of the Vintage' with its corresponding mythical narrative (2.2). Clitophon, though, goes even further.

Among the preparations for Clitophon's wedding, his father purchases a costly dress for the bride, entirely dyed in purple and threaded with gold where normal dresses have purple thread (2.11.2). Wanting to insist on the sumptuousness of the dress, to show how much his father cared about this marriage and how rich his family was[52], he tells the mythical story of the discovery of the dye[53]. The usual tale (Pollux 1.45-9, Nonn. *D*. 40.304-10) is

[47] Clitophon uses the argument from the omission (ἐκ τοῦ ἐλλιποῦς): the example is not appropriate because Menelaus has omitted the disgusting elements. See Theon 76.20ff.; Demoen 1997, 137.

[48] Men. Rh. 339.2-10; Gangloff 2002, 47. Compare with how Ovid undercuts with humour the *pathos* of the abandonment of Ariadne (*Ars Amat*. 1.527-64) and Pasiphae in love with the bull (*Ars Amat*. 1.293-326). See comment in Toohey 1997, 206-7.

[49] Zeus' metamorphoses into animal shapes for the sake of women had been vigorously criticised: e.g. Luc. *Prom*. 17; *Sacr*. 5; *Deor. Conc*. 7; *D. Deor*. 6(2), 8(5).2, 20(12).1.

[50] Men. Rh. 353.4-359.15, in relation to which see Pernot 1993, 209-10.

[51] Theon 115.23-6 [composition of a *prosopopoea*] Πρῶτον μὲν τοίνυν ἁπάντων ἐνθυμηθῆναι δεῖ τό τε τοῦ λέγοντος πρόσωπον ὁποῖόν ἐστι… τήν τε παροῦσαν ἡλικίαν, καὶ τὸν καιρόν, καὶ τὸν τόπον, καὶ τὴν τύχην; 116.5-6 διὰ γένος ἕτεροι μὲν λόγοι τοῦ Λάκωνος παῦροι καὶ λιγέες, ἕτεροι δὲ τοῦ Ἀττικοῦ ἀνδρὸς στωμύλοι.

[52] Clitophon has already described the splendid garden of his house (1.15.1-8), and an opulent dinner in which a costly mixing-bowl made of rock-crystal was used (2.3.1-2)

[53] 2.11.4 Τῆς δὲ ἐσθῆτος οὐ πάρεργον εἶχεν ἡ πορφύρα τὴν βαφήν, ἀλλ᾽ οἷον μυθολογοῦσι Τύριοι τοῦ ποιμένος εὑρεῖν τὸν κύνα, ᾗ καὶ μέχρι τούτου βάπτουσιν Ἀφροδίτης τὸν πέπλον. Describing the mythical origin of an object enhances its effectiveness: see Schmiel 1992, 373-5.

based on a dog playing on the beach with a murex shell, which dyes the dog's mouth red, and the first person who sees it realises the origin of the dye. Only AT recounts the tale with two human characters[54]: a fisherman catches a shell and discards it, thinking it useless, but a shepherd's dog finds it on the beach and breaks it with its teeth, staining its jaws. The shepherd tries to wash off the dye with sea water and realises that the liquid coming out of the mollusc is a powerful tincture. This modification of the mainstream narrative has been read in proleptic terms[55]: Clitophon is not interested in his half-sister despite her beauty (the fisherman rejects the shell as useless), whereas Callisthenes will appreciate her and kidnap the girl (the shepherd benefits from the discovery). This parallel recurs later, when the pirates who have kidnapped Leucippe throw her body into the sea and Clitophon recovers it (5.7). Clitophon walks past Leucippe (5.17), who is unrecognisable because her hair has been cropped and she is covered in dirt and miserably clothed – as in the case of the murex, an unappealing appearance conceals the true nature; Thersander, on the other hand, becomes interested in her simply on hearing of her beauty (6.3 ff.).

The detailed description of the murex prooves that Clitophon does indeed know the animal, a small mollusc of rough appearance and conical shape, with an inner spire protected by a rounded whorl and a row of spines: the dye is the mucus of the hypobranchial gland, located in the innermost part of the shell[56]. Clitophon is an educated Tyrian, who knows the local fauna and tells the local myths which his community is proud of. As Núñez (2008, 323) notes, his use of the third person to refer to his own people (2.2.1 Τύριοι νομίζουσιν, 2.2.2 διηγοῦνται, 2.2.6 ὡς ὁ Τυρίων λόγος, 2.11.4 μυθολογοῦσι Τύριοι) creates a distance which gives the mythological narrative a more erudite character.

Clitophon's mythical narratives portray him as a locally-educated Tyrian who has not left his home. Despite his self-importance, he is only a young speaker who has until recently worked on his rhetorical techniques at school, but has not yet acquired the experience necessary to avoid use of an inappropriate argument.

Mythical narratives also open windows onto different worlds which mirror the main thread of the novel. This is the case of several *ekphraseis* of

[54] Núñez 2008, 321 notes that the three narrative aetiologies of *D&C* (2.2 discovery of wine, 2.11.4-8 discovery of the purple, 8.12 Rhodopis) have a similar "forme bipartite".

[55] Laplace 2007, 210-11.

[56] On the murex and the use of the tincture, see Arist. *Hist. An.* 546b-547b; Ael. *NA* 7.34, 16.1; Plin. *NH* 9.124-138 (esp. the description of the shell in 9.130).

mythological paintings which are turned into narratives[57], such as the diptych of Andromeda and Prometheus (3.6 ff.) and the rape of Philomela (5.3 ff.). These occur in oracular contexts, which Clitophon does not decipher, and are presented in a double movement, studied by Bartsch 1989: their initial narrativised description emphasises several elements, which, while ignored by Clitophon, can be spotted in later developments of the narrative. A second analysis, however, reveals that the parallels are few, and through this second look, AT increases the distance between mythical and novelistic characters.

Searching for an oracle on Clinias and Satyrus, therefore, Leucippe and Clitophon see two paintings in the temple of Zeus Casius (3.6)[58]: Andromeda rescued from a monster by Perseus, and Prometheus rescued from an eagle by Heracles (3.7-8). The former depicts an erotic triangle with three extreme characters: the girl, unbelievably beautiful, blameless, and completely incapable of defending herself; the young man, the perfect groom, handsome, manly, and willing to do anything for her; and the monster, the perfect antagonist, ugly and greedy. The monster (3.7.6-7)[59] is described through neutral observations on its large size and the parts of its body[60], but its jaws receive special attention[61], and these suggest greed.

The second painting features a non-erotic triangle: Prometheus, bound and helpless, is attacked by the voracious bird and rescued by Heracles with a bow. The three roles are similar to those in the first painting, with the beast showing equally gluttonous intentions. The macabre elements of the image are emphasised:

3.8.1-2 Ὄρνις ἐς τὴν Προμηθέως γαστέρα τρυφᾷ· ἔστηκε γὰρ αὐτὴν ἀνοίγων, ἤδη μὲν ἀνεῳγμένην, ἀλλὰ τὸ ῥάμφος ἐς τὸ ὄρυγμα κεῖται, καὶ ἔοικεν ἐπορύττειν τὸ τραῦμα καὶ ζητεῖν τὸ ἧπαρ· τὸ δὲ ἐκφαίνεται τοσοῦτον, ὅσον ἠνέῳξεν ὁ γραφεὺς τὸ διόρυγμα τοῦ τραύματος· ἐρείδει τῷ μηρῷ τῷ τοῦ Προμηθέως τὰς τῶν ὀνύχων ἀκμάς.

As Bartsch (1989, 56-8) suggests, these two paintings foreshadow the ensuing capture of Leucippe by the brigands. The bandits are equated with the

[57] See Núñez 2008, 320 ff.

[58] See Laplace 2007, 132-40; Bartsch 1989, 55-60.

[59] Compare with other descriptions (Luc. *D. mar.* 14.2-4, *De domo* 22; Philostr. *Imag.* 1.29), and artistic depictions (see Elsner 2007, 3-11).

[60] Compare with the descriptions of sea monsters in Ael. *NA*, in relation to their size (16.12, 17.6) and body parts (13.20, 16.12, 16.18), and comparing them with other animals (16.18).

[61] 3.7.7 Ἡ γένυς πολλὴ καὶ μακρά· ἠνέῳκτο δὲ πᾶσα μέχρι τῆς τῶν ὤμων συμβολῆς, καὶ εὐθὺς ἡ γαστήρ.

first monster in their wild, dark appearance[62], and their attack on Leucippe's physical integrity, rupturing her belly to eat her viscera[63], reminds us of Prometheus under torture.

Leucippe is as beautiful as the pictures of mythical women[64], but the brigands are not the equals of the monster and the greedy bird, and it is later revealed that those performing the sacrifice were fake bandits, none other than Satyrus and Menelaus, who attached a false stomach to Leucippe's body and used a fake sword to deceive the gang (3.19). Clitophon, too, falls short of the heroic standards set by Perseus and Heracles[65]: when they are captured, he simply cries (3.10.1), fails to prevent the bandits from choosing Leucippe as a sacrificial victim (3.12.1-2), and witnesses her sacrifice (3.15). The mythical mirror reveals Clitophon's imperfections, presenting the antagonists in a more realistic light and preserving the idealised portrait of Leucippe.

The painting of Philomela[66], too, is introduced in an oracular context:

5.3.3-4 Ὡς οὖν προήλθομεν τῶν θυρῶν, οἰωνὸς ἡμῖν γίνεται πονηρός· χελιδόνα κίρκος διώκων τὴν Λευκίππην εἰς τὴν κεφαλὴν πατάσσει τῷ πτερῷ. Ταραχθεὶς οὖν ἐπὶ τούτῳ καὶ ἀνανεύσας εἰς οὐρανόν, «Ὦ Ζεῦ, τί τοῦτο, ἔφην, φαίνεις ἡμῖν τέρας; Ἀλλ᾽ εἰ τῷ ὄντι σὸς ὁ ὄρνις οὗτος, ἄλλον ἡμῖν σαφέστερον δεῖξον οἰωνόν.» Μεταστραφεὶς οὖν… γραφὴν ὁρῶ κειμένην, ἥτις ὑπῃνίττετο προσόμοιον· Φιλομήλας γὰρ εἶχε φθορὰν καὶ τὴν βίαν Τηρέως καὶ τῆς γλώττης τὴν τομήν.

Clitophon and Menelaus think that both *omina* are equivalent (5.4.1-2), because, after raping his sister-in-law Philomela (who later becomes a swallow), Tereus becomes a hoopoe and chases his wife (a nightingale), just as

[62] 3.9.2 Καὶ ἅμα πλήρης ἦν ἡ γῆ φοβερῶν καὶ ἀγρίων ἀνθρώπων· μεγάλοι πάντες, μέλανες τὴν χροιάν… ψιλοὶ τὰς κεφαλάς, λεπτοὶ τοὺς πόδας, τὸ σῶμα παχεῖς· ἐβαρβάριζον δὲ πάντες; 3.12.1 καὶ τις ἵππον ἐπελαύνων ἔρχεται, κόμην ἔχων πολλὴν καὶ ἀγρίαν.

[63] After capturing Clitophon and Leucippe in a raid, the brigands are ordered by an oracle to sacrifice a maiden and taste her liver in order to purify their den (3.12.1-2, 19.3). See esp. 3.15.4-5 τῶν δὲ νεανίσκων ὁ ἕτερος ἀνακλίνας αὐτὴν ὑπτίαν ἔδησεν ἐκ παττάλων ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐρηρεισμένων… Εἶτα λαβὼν ξίφος βάπτει κατὰ τῆς καρδίας καὶ διελκύσας τὸ ξίφος εἰς τὴν κάτω γαστέρα ῥήγνυσι· τὰ σπλάγχνα δὲ εὐθὺς ἐξεπήδησεν, ἃ ταῖς χερσὶν ἐξελκύσαντες ἐπιτιθέασι τῷ βωμῷ, καὶ ἐπεὶ ὠπτήθη, κατατεμόντες ἅπαντες εἰς μοίρας ἔφαγον.

[64] 1.4.2-3 ἐν ἀριστερᾷ παρθένος [Leucippe] ἐκφαίνεταί μοι καὶ καταστράπτει μου τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τῷ προσώπῳ. Τοιαύτην εἶδον ἐγώ ποτε ἐπὶ ταύρῳ γεγραμμένην Σελήνην.

[65] He has earlier (2.6.1-3) claimed Heracles as his model (see Men. Rh. 405.24-28).

[66] In relation to which, see Bartsch 1989, 65-76; Laplace 2007, 141-6; Núñez 2008, 323-6. The choice of this myth may be related to the charm attributed to narratives on metamorphoses: Men. Rh. 393.1-5.

the hawk chases the swallow. However, in the first omen there are two birds (a male and a female), and in the second, three (one male and two females). Neither are the hawk (κίρκος) and the hoopoe (ἔποψ) equivalent: the hawk is a bird of prey, known for its quick attacks on smaller animals[67], whereas the hoopoe is not a born killer.

As a narrator, Clitophon, assuming that his listener knows the legend, briefly describes two scenes in the painting (5.3.4-8), where Philomela shows her tapestry, depicting Tereus abusing her, to Procne, who nods in understanding, and where the women laugh as they produce the basket containing the remains of Tereus' son, while Tereus is represented leaping from his couch onto the table and drawing his sword. Leucippe asks Clitophon to interpret the painting for her and to explain the presence of the three birds (5.5.1), thus implying the existence of a third scene, with the hoopoe chasing the nightingale and the swallow:

5.5.8-9 γνωρίσας μαίνεται καὶ σπᾶται τὸ ξίφος καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς γυναῖκας τρέχει, ἃς δέχεται ὁ ἀήρ. Καὶ ὁ Τηρεὺς αὐταῖς συναναβαίνει καὶ ὄρνις γίνεται. Καὶ τηροῦσιν ἔτι τοῦ πάθους τὴν εἰκόνα· φεύγει μὲν ἀηδών, διώκει δὲ ὁ Τηρεύς. Οὕτως ἐφύλαξε τὸ μῖσος καὶ μέχρι τῶν πτερῶν.

Ancient references to the three birds are linked to their previous human experiences: Aelian reports the hoopoe's aggressive behaviour and attributes this to its former human existence[68], while female swallows were said to fear male ones because they remembered Tereus (Ael. *NA* 2.3), and swallows were said to avoid Thrace because of Tereus (Pliny *NH* 10.70). The nightingale's song, on the other hand, was a lament for her son[69]. The connection of the myth and the animals is perfect, but, as we have seen, the actual equivalence of the birds in the myth (and the painting) and those in the previous omen is not perfect. Also, in *L&C* paintings of myths do not reflect the reality, and are only mentioned in comparisons related to extraordinary situations[70].

[67] Ael. *NA* 2.42, 3.45; Ps.-Opp. *C*. 3.118-28. The fable of the hawk and the nightingale (Hes. *Op*. 202-12, Aesop 4 H.-H.) illustrates the superiority of the strong over the weak.

[68] Ael. *NA* 3.26; Ovid *Met*. 6.671-4 relates the shape of the bird to Tereus' appearance.

[69] *Od*. 19.522-3; A. *Ag*. 1142-6; Soph. *El*. 148, *OC* 670-8; Eur. *Hel*. 1110; *L&C* 1.15.8; Parthen. fr. 33.2 Lightfoot. Cf. G. Spatafora 1995.

[70] *L&C* 1.4.3 [Clitophon, struck by Leucippe's beauty] Τοιαύτην εἶδον ἐγώ ποτε ἐπὶ ταύρῳ γεγραμμένην Σελήνην; 3.15.4 [the fake sacrifice of Leucippe] τῶν δὲ νεανίσκων ὁ ἕτερος ἀνακλίνας αὐτὴν ὑπτίαν ἔδησεν ἐκ παττάλων ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐρηρεισμένων, οἷον ποιοῦσιν οἱ κοροπλάθοι τὸν Μαρσύαν ἐκ τοῦ φυτοῦ δεδεμένον; 5.13.5 [Clitophon to Melite, who is only toying with her food] Ἀλλὰ σύ γε οὐδενὸς μετέχεις τῶν σαυτῆς, ἀλλ' ἔοικας τοῖς ἐν γραφαῖς ἐσθίουσιν [i.e. an imitation, not a real meal]; 5.22.5 [Melite on Clitophon's unbelievable restraint with her in bed] Ἔοικα δὲ εἰκόνος ἐρᾶν· μέχρι γὰρ τῶν

The painting is a brutal version of what happens when Clitophon and his new wife Melite arrive in Ephesos, believing Leucippe and Melite's husband Thersander to be dead. Leucippe and Thersander resurface alive and Thersander wrongs his wife by chasing Leucippe, just as Tereus had lusted after Philomela[71]. The mention of the rape of Philomela increases the narrative tension of what is a predictable plot: to fulfil the novelistic paradigm, Leucippe needs to preserve her virginity, but a major danger would be required to make readers believe that this is at risk, after she has already survived so many perils.

The expectations created by the myth are subsequently deflated. According to Clitophon, barbarians like Tereus are dominated by their instincts and driven by sadistic motives (5.5.2), and the hoopoe is presented as an insistent, aggressive chaser. Thersander is indeed aggressive and violent at times[72], and persists in chasing Leucippe, but his approach (6.18-19) is far gentler than that of Tereus. Leucippe's feminine fragility draws a parallel with the swallow, but she also proves strong-willed in her defence of her virginity (6.11.3-13.4, 18.1-22.4), and manages to escape with her virginity intact and without harming anybody. Similarly, Melite's angry reaction on reading Leucippe's letter to Clitophon equates her to Procne[73], but her generosity sets her apart: she frees Clitophon (6.1-2), contributes to the defeat of Thersander, and does not hinder the final reunion of the young lovers.

Mythical narratives set ideal, unreal standards which make the main thread of the novel appear closer to reality and expose the nuances of the shortcomings of the characters. The adventures of Leucippe and Clitophon could have been narrated using the technique Hermogenes calls 'telling a

ὀμμάτων ἔχω τὸν ἐρώμενον; 6.1.3 [Melite to Clitophon, dressed as a woman] Ὡς εὐμορφότερος, ἔφη, παρὰ πολὺ γέγονας τῇ στολῇ· τοιοῦτον Ἀχιλλέα ποτὲ ἐθεασάμην ἐν γραφῇ.

[71] Bartsch 1989, 69-70 refers to a double prediction of two love triangles: Clitophon wrongs Leucippe by consenting to have sex with Melite, and Thersander wrongs Melite by violently lusting after Leucippe. See also Morales 2004, 178-180; Marinčič 2007, 189-91; Laplace 2007, 141-6.

[72] Thersander bursts into the room where Melite and Clitophon are dining, pushes away Melite and beats Clitophon (5.23.5-7), and later shouts at Melite for having freed Clitophon (6.9.1). He tries to force Leucippe to receive his kisses, and, when she refuses him, he loses his temper and strikes her on the head (6.18-19). He tries to grab hold of Leucippe and Clitophon in the temple of Artemis, and insults Leucippe and punches Clitophon in the face, even though they are in the temple (8.1).

[73] 5.3.5 Procne δριμὺ ἔβλεπε καὶ ὠργίζετο τῇ γραφῇ; 5.24.3 [Melite] πᾶσαν μαθοῦσα τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐμεμέριστο πολλοῖς ἅμα τὴν ψυχήν, αἰδοῖ καὶ ὀργῇ καὶ ἔρωτι καὶ ζηλοτυπίᾳ· ἠσχύνετο τὸν ἄνδρα, ὠργίζετο τοῖς γράμμασιν, ὁ ἔρως ἐμάραινε τὴν ὀργήν, ἐξῆπτε τὸν ἔρωτα ἡ ζηλοτυπία, καὶ τέλος ἐκράτησεν ὁ ἔρως.

story as a myth': Xenophon, for example, tells the stories of two historical couples, Abradates and Panthea (*Cyr*. 7.3.8ff.) and Tigranes and his wife (*Cyr*. 2.1.36 ff.), as if they were extraordinary, mythical lovers[74]. When Clitophon fails to link properly the myths and his narrative he not only misses a golden opportunity to enhance his own character and his story, but also proves that he has not mastered the basic skills involved in introducing a mythical narrative into a speech.

3. Descriptions of animals.

Just as Tyrian myths serve to construct the personality of Clitophon and to describe the location of the beginning of his love adventures with Leucippe, so does the description of Egyptian animals serve to characterise the main setting of the novel, Egypt[75]. The reader hears about the Egyptian ox (2.15.3-4), the phoenix (3.24.3-25.7), the hippopotamus (4.2.1-3.5), and the crocodile (4.19.1-6).

Egyptian oxen are described when the protagonists are still in Tyre, as a prelude to the future significance of Egypt. The most impressive victims of a magnificent procession are the Egyptian oxen (2.15.3-4), which are large and have characteristic horns which differentiate them from Sicilian and Cypriot species[76], as well as a different skin colour and a proud stance that makes them worthy of being the form of Zeus in the rape of Europa. All these elements appear in natural history treatises[77], except for the pre-eminence of the Egyptian bull over those from Sicily and Cyprus, which could imply the subsequent pre-eminence of Egypt over the other regions. Sicily and Cyprus could have been suitable destinations for Leucippe and Clitophon in their elopement, but when they reach the harbour in Beryto, a ship is about to leave for Alexandria (2.31.6). The circle is closed when they finally arrive in

[74] Hermog. Περὶ ἰδέων 405.6-9 Rabe τὸ μέντοι περὶ τὸν Ἀβραδάτην καὶ τὴν Πάνθειαν πᾶν ἦθός τε καὶ πάθος πολλὰς ἔσχε τὰς ἡδονὰς μυθικῶς πλασθέν, καὶ τὰ περὶ τὸν Τιγράνην δε ὡσαύτως καὶ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ τὴν Ἀρμενίαν. See Gangloff 2002, 43.

[75] See Men. Rh. 387.5-14.

[76] Cf. *Il*. 2.480-1, quoted by Aelian *NA* 11.10 *ad fin*. on the Egyptian ox.

[77] On the size of Egyptian oxen, see Arist. *HA* 606a.21-2. Cf. Aelian *NA* 1.20 (on the rigidity of bulls' horns), 11.10-11 (on the sacred Egyptian bull: 11.10 καὶ τὸ μηνοειδὲς τῆς σελήνης κατηγορεῖ σχῆμα <τῷ> συνιέντι σημεῖον ἄλλο, to be compared with AT 2.15.3 καὶ τὸ θέαμα κυκλουμένης σελήνης ἐστὶν εἰκών), 12.11 (the Egyptians worship a black bull), 19-20 (horns; also Lib. *Prog*. 8.271.5-11), 16.33 (cattle of different origins). In his encomium on the ox, Lib. *Prog*. 8.269.11-14 uses the story of Zeus and Europa to prove the animal's beauty; also Lib. 8.273.3-6. Oxen were suitable topics for an encomium: Aphth. 8.2 (37.16-17 Rabe). Two examples are extant: Lib. *Prog*. 8.267-73, Nic. *Prog*. *RhG* 1.332-3 Walz.

Alexandria during a festival of Serapis and attend a torch-lit procession, the largest and most beautiful that Clitophon has ever seen (5.2.1-2), though no oxen are mentioned here.

The Tyrian boy whose experience of the outside world was limited to the contemplation of exotic species has the opportunity to travel widely in Egypt, but this is far from the real Egypt. The inclusion in the Egyptian fauna of the mythical phoenix and the hippopotamus, which had long been extinct in Egypt, is a mark of the fictionality of Clitophon's account of their adventures.

He first describes the phoenix (3.25)[78], referring to its beauty, colours and distinctive crown, and explaining how after its death the bird's child builds a coffin and takes it to Egypt, where it is buried after its identity has been proved through the revealing of its sexual organs[79]. Leucippe, who has just been buried and then come back to life from her tomb (3.15-21), can thus be easily linked to the phoenix[80]. The peacock is said to be second in beauty to both (1.19.1, 3.25.1), and both Leucippe and the phoenix voluntarily undergo a test to prove their identity and emerge victorious: the phoenix exposes its body to prove its identity, while Leucippe undergoes a rite to prove that she is a virgin in 8.6; she also exposes her body when she goes mad (4.9.2), and as a proof of the treatment she has endured at the hands of Sosthenes[81]. The dramatic transformation of her appearance, when she is tortured and condemned to servitude makes her look like an ephebe[82], which could relate to the hermaphrodite nature of the phoenix. The link with the phoenix elevates Leucippe's status to that of a (fictional) myth, too perfect to be realistic: while Clitophon's imperfections are constantly emphasised – he over-dramatises, talks too much and acts too little – Leucippe always displays the appropriate behaviour. She allows Clitophon to seduce her, but arrives at her wedding still a virgin, enduring all kinds of difficulties without losing her beauty and charm.

[78] On the appearance of the phoenix, see van den Broek 1972, 233-60. On its provenance, *ibid*., 305-34.

[79] 3.25.7 τὰ ἀπόρρητα φαίνει τοῦ σώματος. Cf. van den Broek 1972, 357-89. On the death and resurrection of the phoenix, see van den Broek 1972, 146-232.

[80] Cf. Bartsch 1989, 155-6; Morales 2004, 190ff.

[81] 5.17.6-7 Καὶ ἅμα διανοίξασα τὸν χιτῶνα δείκνυσι τὰ νῶτα διαγεγραμμένα ἔτι οἰκτρότερον. Ὡς οὖν ταῦτα ἠκούσαμεν, ἐγὼ μὲν συνεχύθην· καὶ γάρ τι ἐδόκει Λευκίππης ἔχειν. A comm. on this passage: D. King, *'Taking it like a man': Gender, Identity and the Body in Achilles Tatius' Leucippe and Clitophon*, in *ICAN IV*, Lisbon 2008.

[82] 5.19.2 Satyrus to Clitophon about Leucippe: ἔστιν ἣν εἶδες ἐν τοῖς ἀγροῖς. Τότε μὲν οὖν οὐδ' ἂν ἄλλος αὐτὴν ἰδὼν γνωρίσειεν, ἔφηβον οὕτω γενομένην· τοῦτο γὰρ ἡ τῶν τριχῶν αὐτῆς κουρὰ μόνον ἐνήλλαξεν.

In the opposite sense, the realistic description of the crocodile on the banks of the Nile (4.19)[83] hints towards realism[84]: it is said to lurk half-hidden in the water, waiting for a victim to walk past, because crocodiles were reputed to be malicious predators with a natural instinct to kill, plotting against their victims[85]. Clitophon subtly warns against them by saying that they are stronger than hippopotamuses (4.19.1), and describing them in similar terms to the monster in the painting of Andromeda (3.7.6-7)[86]. He also focuses on the animal's strength, the tail which it uses as a lethal whip (4.19.2-4), and the huge, gaping mouth (4.19.4-6)[87]. This image in itself predicts an attack and characterises the attacker, Chaereas, who spotted Leucippe in the camp but remained inconspicuous, waiting to launch his quick and lethal attack (5.3.1-3).

These animals, then, generate an image of Egypt caught between the real, the mythical and the extinct, a world of mythical relations that is especially conceived to stage an erotic fiction with a tincture of verisimilitude. Herodotus' influential book on Egypt describes the crocodile (2.68-70), the hippopotamus (71), the phoenix (73) and the ibis (76) as iconic Egyptian animals, and it is well known that his descriptions were school models for the exercise of *ekphrasis* (Theon 118.15-17, 120.3-8)[88]. When Clitophon uses them to populate the Egypt Leucippe and he visit in the course of their adventures, and describes them by reproducing the general knowledge about them as contained in treatises such as Aelian's, he is trying to relate his tale to the literary mainstream. Clitophon's descriptions provide yet another proof of his need to show off his rhetorical knowledge, and of the fact that he is still close enough to his schooldays to repeat his well-rehearsed exercise of description of a phoenix in an innocent attempt to appear creative.

4. Conclusions.

If the ultimate purpose of the practice of *progymnasmata* and of rhetori-

[83] Analysed in Laplace 2007, 151-6. The description can be compared with those in Hdt. 2.68-70, Arist. *HA* 503a1-15, Diod. Sic. 1.35, Plin. *NH* 8.89-94, Ael. *NA* 3.11, 10.21, 10.24, 12.41, 17.6.

[84] On the difficult balance between realistic and fictional effects, see Maeder 1991.

[85] See esp. Ael. *NA* 5.23, 9.3, 10.24, 12.15.

[86] 3.7.6 τὰ τῶν φολίδων ἐπάρματα, τὰ τῶν αὐχένων κυρτώματα, ἡ λοφιὰ τῶν ἀκανθῶν, οἱ τῆς οὐρᾶς ἑλιγμοί, paralleled in 4.19.2-3. For 3.7.7, see 4.19.4.

[87] He focuses on the gap between the jaws (4.19.5) and the number and size of the teeth (4.19.6: compare with Ael. *NA*. 10.21).

[88] See also the two extant Aufsatzbücher containing drafts for the description of a phoenix: *P.Lit.Lond*. 193 (cols. III-IV) and *P.Mil.Vogl*. 1.20 (I.1-17), on which see Fernández Delgado- Pordomingo 2008, 170-3; Stramaglia 2003, 226-7.

cal exercises in general is to be able to produce coherent, convincing speeches, then Clitophon's education was a resounding failure. AT provides a fine portrayal of a character type who knows the basic techniques taught at school, but lacks the wit to see rhetorical rules as conveyors of significance, and fails to see that their use alone is not enough to convince if they are not backed up by real knowledge. As has been shown, when Clitophon describes animals, he only refers familiar notions, and does not learn the lessons which animal behaviour could teach him. Clitophon is surrounded, too, by other men who behave similarly in a rhetorical sense, like Satyrus, Charmides and Thersander. The gulf between Clitophon's real knowledge of the world he lives in and the general truths he talks about parallels the gap between the novelistic and the mythical world which he tries to relate to it.

Clitophon's educational failure, however, does prove a success in entertaining the readers, who had probably undergone similar training and thus could appreciate the shortcomings and successes of the characters of the novel. To such an extent was rhetorical training at the core of the culture of the time of AT that he could rely on his readers' rhetorical knowledge for the recognition of the implications of the portrayal of Clitophon: a boy from a well-to-do local family whose verbal resources reveal themselves to be insufficient to face the challenges of the adult world, owing to his lack of real-world knowledge. We may indeed wonder whether AT was in fact using Clitophon to make fun of certain members of his audience[89].

Universidad de Salamanca LAURA MIGUÉLEZ CAVERO

BIBLIOGRAPHY

G. Anderson, *Ancient Fiction: The Novel in the Graeco-Roman World*, London 1984.

Sh. Bartsch, *Decoding the Ancient Novel. The Reader and the Role of Description in Heliodorus and Achilles Tatius*, Princeton 1989.

A. N. Bartley, *Stories from the Mountains, Stories from the Sea. The Digressions and Similes of Oppian's Halieutica and the Cynegetica*, Göttingen 2003.

R. Borgognoni, *Animali al servizio della retorica: a proposito della philia tra vipere e tra scorpioni in Temistio (Or. 7.90BC)*, "Prometheus" 33, 2007, 66-78.

C. Delhay, *Achille Tatius Fabuliste*, "Pallas" 36, 1990, 117-31.

K. Demoen, *A Paradigm for the Analysis of Paradigms: The Rhetorical Exemplum in Ancient and Imperial Greek Theory*, "Rhetorica" 15, 1997, 125-158.

J. Elsner, *Roman Eyes. Visuality and Subjectivity in Art and Text*, Princeton-Oxford 2007.

I. Felten, *Nicolai Progymnasmata* (*Rhetores Graeci* XI), Leipzig 1913.

[89] This article was written at Oxford University thanks to a Postdoctoral Grant of the Spanish Foundation for Science and Technology (FECYT) and the research projects HUM2007-62093/FILO and SA052A08. I should like to thank José Antonio Fernández Delgado and Rodolfo González Equihua for their advice and suggestions.

J. A. Fernández Delgado- F. Pordomingo, *PMilVogl I 20: Bocetos de Progymnásmata*, "ZPE" 159, 2008, 167-92.
R. Fernández Garrido, *Stasis-Theory in Judicial Speeches of Greek Novels*, "GRBS" 49, 2009, 453-72.
A. Gangloff, *Mythes, fables et rhétorique à l'époque impériale*, "Rhetorica" 20, 2002, 25-56.
J.-Ph. Garnaud, *Achille Tatius d'Alexandrie. Le Roman de Leucippé et Clitophon*, Paris 1991.
R. F. Hock, *The Rhetoric of Romance*, in S. E. Porter, *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period. 330 BC-AD 400*, Leiden 1997, 445-465.
J. F. Kindstrand, *Claudius Aelianus und sein Werk*, ANRW II 34.4, 1998, 2954-96.
M. Laplace, *Le roman d'Achille Tatios: 'discours panégyrique' et imaginaire romanesque*, Bern-Oxford 2007.
D. Maeder, *Au seuil des romans grecs: effets de réel et effets de création*, "GCN" 4, 1991, 1-33.
M. Marinčič, *Advertising one's own story. Text and speech in Achilles Tatius' Leucippe and Clitophon*, in V. Rimell (ed.), *Seeing Tongues, Hearing Scripts: Orality and Representation in the Ancient Novel*, Groningen 2007, 168-200.
H. Morales, *The Taming of the View: Natural Curiosities in Leucippe and Kleitophon*, "GCN" 6, 1995, 39-50.
H. Morales, *Vision and Narrative in Achilles Tatius' Leucippe and Clitophon*, Cambridge 2004.
J. R. Morgan, *Kleitophon and Encolpius: Achilleus Tatius as Hidden Author*, in M. Paschalis *et al*. (eds.), *The Greek and the Roman Novel. Parallel Readings*, Groningen 2007, 105-20
L. Núñez, *Mythes enchâssés dans un roman grec: Achille Tatius entre érudition et divertissement*, "Pallas" 78, 2008, 319-34.
M. Patillon, *Corpus Rhetoricum*, Paris 2008.
M. Patillon- G. Bolognesi, *Aelius Théon, Progymnasmata*, Paris 1997.
L. Pernot, *La rhétorique de l'éloge dans le monde gréco-romain*, Paris 1993.
H. Rabe, *Hermogenis Opera* (*Rhetores Graeci* VI), Leipzig 1913.
H. Rabe, *Aphthonii Progymnasmata* (*Rhetores Graeci* X), Leipzig 1926.
E. Rebuffat, *ΠΟΙΗΤΗΣ ΕΠΕΩΝ: tecniche di composizione poetica negli Halieutica di Oppiano*, Firenze 2001.
C. Ruiz Montero, *Chariton von Aphrodisias: Ein Überblick*, ANRW II.34.2, 1994, 1006-54.
D. A. Russell- N. Wilson, *Menander Rhetor*, Oxford 1981.
R. Ch. Schmiel, *Nonnus' Typhonomachy: an Analysis of the Structure of Dionysiaca II*, "RhM" 135, 1992, 369-75.
G. Spatafora, *Il pianto dell'usignolo nella poesia greca arcaica*, "Orpheus" 16, 1995, 98-110
A. Stramaglia, *Amori impossibili. PKöln 250, le raccolte proginnasmatiche e la tradizione retorica dell' 'amante di un ritratto'*, in B.-J. and J.-P. Schröder (eds.), *Studium declamatorium: Untersuchungen zu Schulübungen und Prunkreden von der Antike bis zur Neuzeit*, München-Leipzig 2003, 213-39.
P. Toohey, *Eros and Eloquence: Modes of Amatory Persuasion in Ovid's Ars Amatoria*, in W. J. Dominik (ed.), *Roman Eloquence. Rhetoric in Society and Literature*, London 1997, 198-211.
R. van den Broek, *The Myth of the Phoenix, According to Classical and Early Christian Traditions*, Leiden 1972.
T. Whitmarsh, *Reading for Pleasure: Narrative, Irony, and Erotics in Achilles Tatius*, in S. Panayotakis, M. Zimmerman, and W. Keulen (eds.), *The Ancient Novel and Beyond*, Leiden 2003, 191-205.